



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/539,231	03/30/2000	Giampiero M. Sierra	MSI-485US	7846
22801	7590	05/20/2004	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			HA, LEYNNA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/539,231

Applicant(s)

SIERRA ET AL.

Examiner

LEYNNA T. HA

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2-26-2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2135

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-29 have been re-examined with the amended limitations and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).
2. This is a FINAL rejection because Applicant's amendment includes new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mears, Et Al. (US 6,438,580), and further in view of Liddy, Et Al. (US 6,026,388).**

As per claim 1:

Mears, Et Al. teaches a method for use in a computer comprising:

Art Unit: 2135

while booting a computer and prior to allowing a user to logon on the computer (**col.4, lines 11-15**), arranging for a markup language rendering engine (**col.4, lines 43-46**) to be loaded substantially near the beginning of an operating system initialization procedure; (**col.5, lines 11-15**) and

providing markup language code suitable for use with the markup language rendering engine (**col.5, lines 31-43**), the markup language being capable of soliciting at least one user input (**col.5, lines 60-67**) when rendered by the markup language rendering engine, the user input being associated with a user registration process (**col.7, lines 44-62**).

The Examiner asserts user registration of Mears (**col.7, lines 47-54**) can also be a logon process because both the registration and logon process is where personal information is entered regarding the user to identify him/her to the computer. Although, Mears did teach the registration/logon process, Mears did not fully disclose to selectively allow a user to logon to a computer.

Liddy, Et Al. discloses the logon process in the form of a sign-on utilizing the GUI screen to allow users to interact with the system to select data resources, to create a natural language query, and to select criteria for retrieving and displaying documents. Liddy discusses that the GUI screens includes pull-down menus, a menu bar and various on screen windows for user inputs and interactions (**col.27, lines 6-52**). Further, Liddy teaches the selective sign-on process at the initial screen where only users with registered usernames and valid passwords are allowed for access (**col.28, lines 41-50**).

Art Unit: 2135

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include selectively allow a user to logon to the computer would be for security purposes wherein only users that are registered that enters a registered username and valid password are allowed to proceed **(col.28, lines 47-50).**

As per claim 2:

Mears disclose providing the markup language code further includes providing user data, the user data being operatively associated with the user logon process. **(col.7, lines 44-62)**

As per claim 3:

Mears discloses the user data includes data selected from a set comprising a list of users, a text identifier, a graphical identifier, a password enabled identifier, and password hint data, and related user information data. **(col.7, lines 45-54)**

As per claim 4:

Mears includes configuring the markup language rendering engine to display at least a portion of the user data based on the markup language code. **(col.4, lines 36-50)**

As per claim 5:

As rejected in claim 1 and further includes Liddy discussing configuring the markup language code to provide the user input to an authorization entity for validation determination. **(col.28, lines 45-48)**

Art Unit: 2135

As per claim 6:

Mears discusses the user input includes at least one input selected from a group of inputs comprising a user name (**col.7, lines 50-51**), and Liddy discusses a user identifier and a password (**col.28, lines 45-48**).

As per claim 7:

Mears includes hypertext markup language (HTML). (**col.3, lines 41-42**)

As per claim 8:

Mears teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for causing one or more processors to perform acts comprising while booting a computer and prior to allowing a user to logon on the computer (**col.4, lines 11-15**), arranging for a markup language rendering engine (**col.4, lines 43-46**) to be loaded substantially near the beginning of an operating system initialization procedure; (**col.5, lines 11-15**) and providing markup language code suitable for use with the markup language rendering engine (**col.5, lines 31-43**), the markup language being capable of soliciting at least one user input (**col.5, lines 60-67**) when rendered by the markup language rendering engine, the user input being associated with a user registration process (**col.7, lines 44-62**).

The Examiner asserts user registration of Mears (**col.7, lines 47-54**) can also be a logon process because both the registration and logon process is

Art Unit: 2135

where personal information is entered regarding the user to identify him/her to the computer. Although, Mears did teach the registration/logon process, Mears did not fully disclose to selectively allow a user to logon to a computer.

Liddy, Et Al. discloses the logon process in the form of a sign-on utilizing the GUI screen to allow users to interact with the system to select data resources, to create a natural language query, and to select criteria for retrieving and displaying documents. Liddy discusses that the GUI screens includes pull-down menus, a menu bar and various on screen windows for user inputs and interactions (**col.27, lines 6-52**). Further, Liddy teaches the selective sign-on process at the initial screen where only users with registered usernames and valid passwords are allowed for access (**col.28, lines 41-50**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include selectively allow a user to logon to the computer would be for security purposes wherein only users that are registered that enters a registered username and valid password are allowed to proceed (**col.28, lines 47-50**).

As per claim 9:

Mears disclose providing the markup language code further includes providing user data, the user data being operatively associated with the user logon process. (**col.7, lines 44-62**)

As per claim 10:

Art Unit: 2135

Mears discloses the user data includes data selected from a set comprising a list of users, a text identifier, a graphical identifier, a password enabled identifier, and password hint data, and related user information data. **(col.7, lines 45-54)**

As per claim 11:

Mears includes configuring the markup language rendering engine to display at least a portion of the user data based on the markup language code. **(col.4, lines 36-50)**

As per claim 12:

As rejected in claim 8 and further includes Liddy discussing configuring the markup language code to provide the user input to an authorization entity for validation determination. **(col.28, lines 45-48)**

As per claim 13:

Mears discusses the user input includes at least one input selected from a group of inputs comprising a user name **(col.7, lines 50-51)**, and Liddy discusses a user identifier and a password **(col.28, lines 45-48)**.

As per claim 14:

Mears includes hypertext markup language (HTML). **(col.3, lines 41-42)**

As per claim 15:

Mears teaches an arrangement including a memory, a data storage device, a display device, and a processor operatively coupled to the memory,

Art Unit: 2135

data storage device and the display device, the arrangement comprising **(col.4, lines 28-35)**:

a markup language rendering engine **(col.4, lines 43-46)** stored within the data storage device and suitable for loading in the memory **(col.4, lines 8-10)** substantially near the beginning of an operating system initialization procedure **(col.5, lines 11-15)** while booting a computer and prior to allowing a user to logon on the computer **(col.4, lines 11-15)**; and

markup language code suitable stored in the data storage device and configurable for use with the markup language rendering engine **(col.5, lines 31-43)**, the markup language being capable of soliciting at least one user input **(col.5, lines 60-67)** when rendered by the markup language rendering engine, the user input being associated with a user registration process **(col.7, lines 44-62)**.

The Examiner asserts user registration of Mears **(col.7, lines 47-54)** can also be a logon process because both the registration and logon process is where personal information is entered regarding the user to identify him/her to the computer. Although, Mears did teach the registration/logon process, Mears did not fully disclose to selectively allow a user to logon to a computer.

Liddy, Et Al. discloses the logon process in the form of a sign-on utilizing the GUI screen to allow users to interact with the system to select data resources, to create a natural language query, and to select criteria for retrieving and displaying documents. Liddy discusses that the GUI screens

Art Unit: 2135

includes pull-down menus, a menu bar and various on screen windows for user inputs and interactions **(col.27, lines 6-52)**. Further, Liddy teaches the selective sign-on process at the initial screen where only users with registered usernames and valid passwords are allowed for access **(col.28, lines 41-50)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention combine Mears to include selectively allow a user to logon to the computer of Liddy would be for security purposes wherein only users that are registered that enters a registered username and valid password are allowed to proceed **(col.28, lines 47-50)**.

As per claim 16:

Mears disclose providing the markup language code further includes providing user data, the user data being operatively associated with the user logon process. **(col.7, lines 44-62)**

As per claim 17:

Mears discloses the user data includes data selected from a set comprising a list of users, a text identifier, a graphical identifier, a password enabled identifier, and password hint data, and related user information data. **(col.7, lines 45-54)**

As per claim 18:

Mears includes configuring the markup language rendering engine to display at least a portion of the user data based on the markup language code. **(col.4, lines 36-50)**

As per claim 19:

As rejected in claim 16 and further includes Liddy discussing a user input to an authorization entity for validation determination based on the markup language code. **(col.28, lines 45-48)**

As per claim 20:

Mears discusses the user input includes at least one input selected from a group of inputs comprising a user name **(col.7, lines 50-51)**, and Liddy discusses a user identifier and a password **(col.28, lines 45-48)**.

(col.7, lines 37-38)

As per claim 21:

Mears includes hypertext markup language (HTML). **(col.3, lines 41-42)**

As per claim 22:

Mears teaches a method for use in booting a computer and logging users onto the computer the method comprising:

prior to allowing a user to logon to a computer **(col.4, lines 11-15)**, loading a markup language rendering engine **(col.4, lines 43-46)** substantially near the beginning of an operating system initialization procedure; **(col.5, lines 11-15)**

retrieving user data from the operating system; **(col.5, lines 20-30)**

Art Unit: 2135

rendering markup language code associated with a logon screen using at least a portion of the user data; **(col.4, lines 36-50)**

collecting at least one user input associated with the logon screen; and **(col.7, lines 50-51)**

The Examiner asserts user registration of Mears **(col.7, lines 47-54)** can also be a logon process because both the registration and logon process is where personal information is entered regarding the user to identify him/her to the computer. Although, Mears did teach the user input associated with the registration/logon screen, Mears did not fully disclose establishing a logon session if the user input is valid.

Liddy, Et Al. discloses the logon process in the form of a sign-on utilizing the GUI screen to allow users to interact with the system to select data resources, to create a natural language query, and to select criteria for retrieving and displaying documents. Liddy discusses that the GUI screens includes pull-down menus, a menu bar and various on screen windows for user inputs and interactions **(col.27, lines 6-52)**. Further, Liddy teaches the sign-on process at the initial screen establishing a logon session if the user input is valid **(col.28, lines 48-50)**.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include establishing a logon session if the user input is valid as taught in Liddy, would be for security purposes wherein only users

Art Unit: 2135

that are registered that enters a registered username and valid password are allowed to proceed (**col.28, lines 44-50**).

As per claim 23:

Mears discusses the user input associated with the registration/logon screen (**col.7, lines 47-54**). However, Mears did not fully disclose causing the user input to be authenticated.

Liddy, Et Al. discloses the logon process in the form of a sign-on utilizing the GUI screen to allow users to interact with the system to select data resources, to create a natural language query, and to select criteria for retrieving and displaying documents (**col.27, lines 6-52**). Further, Liddy teaches the sign-on process including registered username and valid password entered by the user (**col.28, lines 48-50**), which is in the form of authenticating the user input.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to authenticate the user input as taught in Liddy, would be for security purposes wherein only users that are registered that enters a registered username and valid password are allowed to proceed (**col.28, lines 44-50**).

As per claim 24:

Art Unit: 2135

As rejected in claim 22 and further includes Liddy discussing providing the user input to an authorization entity for validation determination. **(col.28, lines 45-48)**

As per claim 25:

Mears discloses the user data includes data selected from a set comprising a list of users, a text identifier, a graphical identifier, a password enabled identifier, and password hint data, and related user information data. **(col.7, lines 45-54)**

As per claim 26:

Huang includes hypertext markup language (HTML). **(col.3, lines 41-42)**

As per claim 27:

Mears teaches a markup language based logon user interface arrangement for user in logging users onto of a computer, the user interface comprising:

a logon screen displayed while booting the computer and prior to allowing a user to logon to a computer; **(col.4, lines 11-35)**

a user logon area within the logon screen **(col.7, lines 42-47)**, the user logon area visually identifying a plurality of users using text identifiers and graphical identifiers, such that each text identifier and graphical identifier are selectable by the user through the user interface **(col.7, lines 57-59)**. The

Art Unit: 2135

Examiner asserts user registration of Mears (**col.7, lines 47-54**) can also be a logon process because both the registration and logon process is where personal information is entered regarding the user to identify him/her to access the computer.

Although, Mears did teach the user input associated with the registration/logon screen, Mears did not fully disclose prompting the user to input a password and a single selectable shut down mechanism configured to shut the computer down when selected through the user interface by the user.

It is inherent that computers have a shut down mechanism option placed on a window for a user to select when wanting to shut the computer off. The Examiner ascertains the shut down option and the logon option is amongst the various functions if an appropriate command is selected on the screen.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prompt a user to input a password as taught in Liddy, would be for security purposes wherein only registered users who inputs a valid password are allowed to proceed (**col.28, lines 44-50**).

As per claim 28:

Mears discloses the logon screen (**col.7, lines 47-52**) is rendered substantially near the beginning of the initialization of the operating system using a markup language rendering engine (**col.4, lines 11-46**).

As per claim 29:

Mears includes hypertext markup language (HTML). (**col.3, lines 41-42**)

Conclusion

******For more details and explanations on the rejection above, please refer to:***

MEARS, ET AL. on col.3, line 2...Et. SEQ.

LIDDY, ET AL. on col.5, line 2...Et. SEQ.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEYNNA T. HA whose telephone number is (703) 305-3853. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:00 - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LHa


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2103